



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,251	10/14/2003	Robert J. Falster	MEMC 96-0056 (2101.3)	3992
321	7590	02/08/2005	EXAMINER	
SENNIGER POWERS LEAVITT AND ROEDEL ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE 16TH FLOOR ST LOUIS, MO 63102			KUNEMUND, ROBERT M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1765	

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/685,251

Applicant(s)

FALSTER ET AL.

Examiner

Robert M Kunemund

Art Unit

1765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 21 to 24 and 30 to 40 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 to 13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,840,997. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference between the instant claims and the patented claims is the pull rate. However, pull rates are art recognized result effective parameters and can be varied by one of ordinary skill in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the patented claims to include the instantly claimed pull rate in order to grow a silicon ingot with specific defect patterns.

Claims 21 to 24 and 30 to 40 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 to 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,632,278. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not

Art Unit: 1765

patentably distinct from each other because the difference between the instant claims and the patented claims is the pull rate. However, pull rates are art recognized result effective parameters and can be varied by one of ordinary skill in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the patented claims to include the instantly claimed pull rate in order to grow a silicon ingot with specific defect patterns.

Claims 21 to 40 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 7 to 23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,409,827. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference between the instant claims and the patented claims is the pull rate. However, pull rates are art recognized result effective parameters and can be varied by one of ordinary skill in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the patented claims to include the instantly claimed pull rate in order to grow a silicon ingot with specific defect patterns.

Claims 21 to 40 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 to 27 of U.S. Patent No. 6,409,826. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference between the instant claims and the patented claims is the pull rate. However, pull rates are art recognized result effective parameters and can be varied by one of ordinary skill in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the patented claims to include the instantly claimed pull rate in order to grow a silicon ingot with specific defect patterns.

Art Unit: 1765

Claims 21 to 24 and 30 to 40 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11 to 21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,287,380. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference between the instant claims and the patented claims is the pull rate. However, pull rates are art recognized result effective parameters and can be varied by one of ordinary skill in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the patented claims to include the instantly claimed pull rate in order to grow a silicon ingot with specific defect patterns.

Claims 21 to 24 and 30 to 40 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 to 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,254,672. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference between the instant claims and the patented claims is the pull rate. However, pull rates are art recognized result effective parameters and can be varied by one of ordinary skill in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the patented claims to include the instantly claimed pull rate in order to grow a silicon ingot with specific defect patterns.

Claims 21 to 24 and 30 to 40 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 21 to 40 of U.S. Patent No. 5,919,302. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference between the instant claims

Art Unit: 1765

and the patented claims is the pull rate. However, pull rates are art recognized result effective parameters and can be varied by one of ordinary skill in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the patented claims to include the instantly claimed pull rate in order to grow a silicon ingot with specific defect patterns.

Claims 21 to 24 and 30 to 40 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11 to 16 of copending Application No. 10/639,737. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference between the instant claims and the patented claims is the pull rate. However, pull rates are art recognized result effective parameters and can be varied by one of ordinary skill in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the patented claims to include the instantly claimed pull rate in order to grow a silicon ingot with specific defect patterns.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M Kunemund whose telephone number is 571-272-1464. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hours.

Art Unit: 1765

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on 571-272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RMK



ROBERT KUNEMUND
PRIMARY EXAMINER